

Code vs. Context: STEM Students' Resistance to Non-STEM Coursework

Md Abdullah Al Kafi^{*}, Raka Moni^{*}, Sumit Kumar Banshal[†]

^{*}Daffodil International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

[†]Alliance University, Bengaluru, India

Abstract—Many STEM programs now require students to take non-technical courses to develop the soft skills necessary for STEM fields, and engineering students frequently resist this requirement. Many studies suggest that this resistance is attributable to heavy workloads, but very little is known about its cognitive and identity-related aspects. This study fills this knowledge gap by examining the effects of cognitive switching costs, work overload, and role ambiguity on students' affective resistance to non-STEM coursework. This study also examines how that resistance, in turn, affects their willingness to engage with the material and their long-term adoption of the skills taught in the course. We collected survey data from 212 undergraduate Computer Science and Engineering students and used them to test directional relationships among these constructs using sequential OLS regression rather than structural equation modeling. Role Ambiguity emerged as the strongest predictor of Affective Resistance ($\beta = 0.47, p < 0.001$), exceeding the effects of Work Overload ($\beta = 0.20, p = 0.007$) and Cognitive Switching Cost ($\beta = 0.14, p = 0.038$). Affective Resistance significantly reduced Willingness to Engage ($\beta = -0.25, p < 0.001$), while Willingness to Engage strongly predicted Long-Term Adoption ($\beta = 0.55, p < 0.001$). Our results indicate that student resistance to non-STEM courses is primarily driven by the incongruence between the content of these courses and their emergent identity as engineers, rather than by workload or cognitive effort alone. To address this, curricula should focus on reducing role ambiguity by placing humanities and social science material in clear engineering contexts that strengthen students' professional identity.

Index Terms—Engineering Education, Student Resistance, Role Ambiguity, Professional Identity, Cognitive Switching Cost, Soft Skills

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Context and Problem Statement

Modern engineering programs now place greater emphasis on students' ability to work in multidisciplinary teams and communicate effectively with stakeholders [1]. The adages calling for the re-evaluation of engineering education persist because they have led to accreditation requirements by professional engineering societies, which have caused a shift in how courses are taught and evaluated [2]. For example, there is now considerable emphasis on students' ability to work in teams and communicate effectively with both engineers and non-engineers; consequently, many Computer Science and Engineering programs require non-STEM courses, such as those in the humanities and social sciences.

But despite their good intentions, many engineering students push back against these classes because, to them, communication, ethics, and other non-STEM classes are non-canonical

side quests that don't make them better engineers. This results in a delta that is difficult to calculate: the skills that employers report wanting most are the skills that students are most averse to obtaining; therefore, unless we understand the causes of this resistance and how to minimize it, schools will graduate superior technical problem solvers who are unable to function in the world.

Recent engineering education research has shown that student resistance is more than a pedagogical issue; it is an identity issue, because engineering students typically see themselves as precise problem solvers and therefore struggle with courses that appear interpretive, qualitative, or open-ended [3], [4]. To design interdisciplinary experiences that STEM students find meaningful, it is essential to understand the psychological factors at play and to address the perceived disconnect between students' problem-solving identity and non-STEM ways of thinking.

B. Research Gap

The information systems and organizational psychology literature typically cite factors such as workload pressure, status quo bias, and technostress to explain resistance [5], [6]. However, these factors apply primarily to professional contexts where professional identities are already formed and do not take into account the developmental nature of undergraduate engineering programs where students are actively developing their professional identities.

Two mechanisms of resistance in particular have recently been identified as being particularly useful in explaining resistance in academic settings:

- **Role Ambiguity** — Occurs when the uncertainty surrounding how non-STEM content aligns with a student's emerging professional identity. This construct has deep theoretical roots in organizational behavior [7].
- **Cognitive Switching Cost** — It refers to the process of switching between algorithmic problem solving of the technical material and the more interpretive, qualitative thinking of the non-STEM material, which is a real cognitive cost because classic cognitive psychology research on task switching shows that it imposes measurable costs and slows performance. [8].

These mechanisms are intriguing, but few have been investigated in parallel or directly compared as predictors of resistance in engineering education [9]. Furthermore, despite the widely acknowledged difficulties of interdisciplinary integration in higher education, little is known about how

psychological resistance to soft skills relates to tangible behavioral outcomes, such as willingness to engage and long-term adoption.

Addressing these gaps in knowledge necessitates the development of an integrative model that outlines the causal paths through which cognitive strain and identity misalignment produce affective resistance, disengagement, and decreased adoption of skills. This model must be combined with a focus on measurement and reliability that ensures that core constructs are reliably measured consistently and rigorously [10].

C. Study Objective and Contribution

The purpose of this study is to explore and compare the cognitive and affective drivers of engineering students' resistance to non-STEM coursework and their effect on students' engagement and long-term uptake of soft skills, and the authors propose and validate a regression-based model that delineates the directional relationships between Cognitive Switching Cost, Work Overload, Role Ambiguity, Affective Resistance, Willingness to Engage, and Long-Term Adoption.

This study makes three key contributions:

- 1) **A unified empirical comparison of resistance mechanisms:** This paper explores how the three sets of factors (cognitive, structural, and identity-based) simultaneously contribute to student resistance within one model, allowing the unique contribution of each to students' attitudes to be made clear.
- 2) **Evidence-based guidance for curriculum design:** By isolating the mechanisms most closely associated with resistance and engagement, this study provides guidance for creating context- and identity-based non-STEM courses that more effectively support the objectives of engineering education [1].
- 3) **A mediated explanation for soft-skill adoption:** The model suggests that Affective Resistance may inhibit student engagement, which would in turn retard the long-term adoption of key interdisciplinary skills, and this sheds some light on why integrating soft skills into STEM curricula has remained a perennial problem.

In summary, this research aims to identify the psychological factors underlying resistance, so that institutions can develop curricular interventions aligned with the evolving professional identities of engineering students.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Affective Resistance in Academic Contexts

Affective Resistance is a form of emotional resistance, a negative gut feeling that makes a learner less receptive to the material or to how it is being taught. Research from the psychology literature has consistently shown that negative emotions are a potent inhibitor of engagement [11], and in the higher education context, affective resistance typically results in disengagement, avoidance, or passive compliance [12]. While the concept of resistance has been extensively researched in the workplace and technology contexts, such

as technostress, status quo bias, and information overload, resistance in the academic context is qualitatively different because students cannot easily avoid required courses [6], [13], [14].

The general resistance of engineering students to non-STEM courses often stems from their not seeing them as relevant to the work they will do in the future. Therefore, reflective, communicative, and interpretive work is likely to be dismissed as irrelevant to their technical identities, as this dismissal is also reinforced by program cultures that foreground technical mastery and downplay qualitative reasoning [1], [15]. In this way, Affective Resistance is a key barrier to interdisciplinary learning, shaping how students judge, engage with, and ultimately benefit from non-STEM requirements.

B. Role Ambiguity and Identity Alignment

The construct of role ambiguity, which encompasses uncertainty regarding what is expected, who is responsible for what, and/or how performance will be judged, offers a useful conceptual lens for examining student resistance to interdisciplinary coursework in engineering programs [7] because role ambiguity is particularly salient in engineering when students are unable to perceive a relationship between their non-STEM coursework and their anticipated professional roles [3]. This ambiguity triggers cognitive dissonance, a decrease in perceived value, and a reduction in engagement.

Engineering identity formation research shows that students develop strong professional identities early in their engineering programs [4], [16], and if a course does not fit with that emerging identity, they will be more likely to peripheralize it, and further, prior work has found that identity development strongly influences what students value in their learning experiences, which, in turn, directly affects their motivation and legitimacy of non-technical work [17].

Interdisciplinary studies further support this: identity misalignment reduces engagement, lowers perceived utility, and inhibits skill integration [9], [18]. Thus, Role Ambiguity serves as a theoretically grounded explanation for resistance toward non-STEM coursework and helps clarify why engineering students often fail to recognize its professional relevance.

C. Cognitive Switching Cost and Task-Switching Demands

Cognitive Switching Cost refers to the mental effort required to transition between distinct cognitive modes or problem-solving styles. Foundational research shows that switching tasks imposes measurable cognitive load and performance delays [8], [19]. Rubinstein et al. further demonstrate that task-switching demands engage executive control systems, increasing mental fatigue [20].

Engineering students must oscillate between the deterministic, algorithmic thinking they use in their technical courses, and the more interpretive, context-dependent reasoning they must use in their non-STEM courses, which can be cognitively demanding and counterintuitive for students who strongly identify as technical problem solvers. According to the principles of Cognitive Load Theory, this cognitively demanding oscillation requires students to hold multiple conflicting schemas

in working memory simultaneously and is likely to increase cognitive load and frustration [21].

Although Cognitive Switching Cost is well-grounded theoretically, it remains an under-researched concept in engineering education because the core idea is simple: as students switch between technical and qualitative reasoning, they will experience cognitive dissonance, and will subsequently dislike courses that require this switching; therefore, cognitive effort rather than motivation is a key driver of Affective Resistance.

D. Work Overload and Perceived Academic Burden

Work Overload can be most simply defined as the perception that academic or organizational demands exceed a student's time or cognitive resources [5]. Given the heavy technical workload that is typical of an engineering curriculum, students perceive the additional non-STEM requirements as extra work [22]. However, the literature on technology resistance suggests that "too much work" is a simplistic explanation that can hide deeper psychological or identity-related reasons for resistance [6].

However, in interdisciplinary contexts, what students attribute to "workload" may in fact be more related to mental switching between cognitive modes or ambiguous expectations than sheer hours. It is therefore essential to unpack the underlying mechanisms to determine whether Work Overload is the genuine driver of resistance, or simply a complaint about the discomfort of unfamiliar thinking.

E. T-Shaped Competencies and Interdisciplinary Skill Integration

In engineering education today, there is a growing recognition of the need for T-shaped engineers: those who are not only technically deep in one field but also have broad skills in communication, collaboration, ethics, and contextual understanding [23]. Major national and international education organizations have been uniform in declaring that the kind of interdisciplinary breadth that we offer is an essential ingredient for innovation, leadership, and making a difference in the world [24].

Integrative learning research shows that when students are actively engaged in non-STEM courses, they develop professional judgment and adaptability—but only if they are willing to "lean in [25]," which is often hampered by role ambiguity and affective resistance. T-shaped competency models make it clear that understanding these resistance mechanisms is critical, as they ultimately determine whether interdisciplinary skill-building will take root or be blocked by psychological barriers.

F. Affective Resistance as a Mediating Mechanism

While role ambiguity, cognitive switching costs, and work overload are each part of the explanation, none of these individually can explain the full range of emotional and behavioral manifestations we see in engineering students, because affective resistance is the critical link that connects the cognitive strain and identity dissonance to the effects, that is, the extent

to which students engage, whether they persist, and whether they develop new skills. Moreover, resistance affects not only how students feel about non-STEM coursework but also their willingness to engage and, eventually, their acquisition of interdisciplinary competencies [1].

This framework provides a simple structure for assessing how these psychological processes interact and serves as the basis for the regression-based statistical model used in this study to examine the impact of these antecedents on students' engagement and subsequent skill retention.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Dataset

Data were drawn from the STEM Student Course Perception (SSCP) dataset ($N = 212$ Computer Science and Engineering undergraduates from three different universities). The instrument included five demographic variables and 15 Likert-scale items (1-5) assessing constructs such as Role Ambiguity, Switching Cost, and Affective Resistance. The survey achieved a valid response rate suitable for SEM analysis. Full psychometric properties, raw data, and codebooks are available in the associated open-access repositories [26] and [27].

B. Research Design

This study uses a quantitative, cross-sectional survey to investigate the psychological and structural factors that lead engineering students to resist mandatory non-STEM courses and to test directional relationships among observed variables using a regression-based statistical model. The study investigates the effect of six constructs: Cognitive Switching Cost, Work Overload, Role Ambiguity, Affective Resistance, Willingness to Engage, and Long-Term Adoption of soft skills.

C. Participants and Sampling

A total of 212 undergraduate students from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at a private university in Bangladesh participated in this study, as students in the CSE department were chosen because their curriculum includes many non-STEM subjects. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and written informed consent was obtained from all participants before data collection, which was conducted via an online self-administered survey distributed through the university's official communication channels.

D. Measures

Each construct was assessed with multi-item Likert scales ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), and all items were taken from established sources to reflect the constructs of interest explicitly. Internal consistency was evaluated via Cronbach's alpha, and all scales surpassed the suggested criteria for acceptable reliability of $\alpha \geq 0.70$.

Cognitive Switching Cost: Measures capture the mental effort it takes to switch from analytical STEM tasks to interpretive non-STEM tasks, as informed by the literatures on task switching and cognitive load.

Work Overload: This was assessed by adapting questions from previous research on workload and techno stress, measuring students' perceptions of excessive schoolwork relative to their available time and cognitive capacity, and by a comprehensive evaluation of students' workload.

Role Ambiguity: Assessed by items drawn from classic role theory, and items assess students' perceptions of clarity regarding how their non-STEM courses are related to their educational or occupational goals.

Affective Resistance: Affective Resistance involves questions measuring irritation, frustration, and other negative affective states toward non-STEM coursework, which align with the affective components of student resistance identified in prior research.

Willingness to Engage: Engagement is assessed through items asking whether students are interested in taking non-STEM courses and applying their knowledge in other coursework, and this assessment is used to evaluate student engagement.

Long-Term Adoption: Long-Term Adoption is captured through items that ask about the likelihood that students will use non-STEM competencies, such as communication and contextual thinking, in their future coursework or professional careers.

E. Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed online and completed outside scheduled class hours. Respondents provided informed consent prior to participation. No incentives were offered, and no identifying information was collected. Data were used exclusively for academic research.

F. Analytical Strategy

All analyses were conducted using the Python packages pandas and statsmodels, and to assess the directional relationships between the constructs, we estimated a set of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models.

Three regression models were estimated:

- 1) **Model 1:** Cognitive Switching Cost, Work Overload, and Role Ambiguity predicting Affective Resistance.
- 2) **Model 2:** Affective Resistance predicting Willingness to Engage.
- 3) **Model 3:** Willingness to Engage predicting Long-Term Adoption.

1) *Diagnostics:* The standard OLS diagnostics were applied, and the assumptions of linearity, normality of residuals, and homoskedasticity are satisfactory. Multicollinearity was checked via VIFs, with all values below the common cutoffs indicating no issues, while the internal consistency was also good because Cronbach's alpha was above the recommended threshold of $\alpha \geq 0.70$ for all multi-item scales.

G. Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the institutional ethics guidelines, and participation was voluntary, because the respondents provided informed consent, while remaining anonymous as no identifying information was requested, and the data were used only for academic research.

IV. RESULTS

A. Preliminary Diagnostics

Before hypothesis testing, the dataset was examined for missing values, outliers, and inconsistent patterns. No major issues were identified. All constructs demonstrated acceptable internal reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values meeting or exceeding the recommended threshold of $\alpha \geq 0.70$ (see Table I).

Standard OLS diagnostics confirmed that regression assumptions were adequately met. Residuals showed no meaningful deviations from normality, variance appeared homoskedastic based on visual inspection, and all Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were below commonly accepted thresholds, indicating no multicollinearity concerns among predictors.

B. Descriptive Statistics

Table I presents the descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients, and correlations for all study variables. Cognitive Switching Cost and Work Overload showed mean values above the scale midpoint, indicating that students regularly experience cognitive strain and workload demands. Role Ambiguity showed a lower mean value relative to these antecedents, suggesting that most students felt some clarity about the role of non-STEM coursework.

Affective Resistance exhibited mean values below the midpoint, while both Willingness to Engage and Long-Term Adoption displayed mean values above the midpoint. This pattern suggests that although students encounter cognitive or structural challenges, they generally recognize the value of non-STEM competencies.

C. Hypothesis 1: Antecedents Predicting Affective Resistance

Hypothesis 1 proposed that Cognitive Switching Cost, Role Ambiguity, and Work Overload would positively predict Affective Resistance.

As shown in Table II, the model predicting Affective Resistance was significant and accounted for a meaningful proportion of variance. Role Ambiguity emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.47, p < .001$), followed by Work Overload ($\beta = 0.20, p = .007$). Cognitive Switching Cost also demonstrated a statistically significant but smaller effect ($\beta = 0.14, p = .038$).

These findings support Hypothesis 1 and indicate that uncertainty regarding the relevance of non-STEM courses (Role Ambiguity) contributes more strongly to emotional resistance than cognitive strain or workload pressure.

D. Hypothesis 2: Affective Resistance Predicting Willingness to Engage

Hypothesis 2 predicted that Affective Resistance would negatively influence Willingness to Engage.

As presented in Table II, Affective Resistance showed a significant negative effect on Willingness to Engage ($\beta = -0.25, p < .001$). Students who reported higher emotional

TABLE I
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, RELIABILITIES, AND CORRELATIONS ($N = 212$)

Construct	Mean	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Cognitive Switching Cost	3.35	0.84	0.72	–						
2. Perceived Benefit	3.47	0.81	0.67	-.10	–					
3. Work Overload	3.77	0.80	0.72	.44**	-.09	–				
4. Role Ambiguity	3.43	0.83	0.59	.32**	-.20*	.36**	–			
5. Affective Resistance	3.31	0.90	0.75	.35**	-.26**	.39**	.54**	–		
6. Willingness to Engage	3.29	0.71	0.64	-.09	.33**	-.23*	-.31**	-.38**	–	
7. Long-Term Adoption	3.48	0.86	n/a	.02	.33**	-.05	-.19*	-.25**	.46**	–

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$. Diagonal elements represent reliability.

TABLE II
REGRESSION RESULTS (STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS)

Dependent Variable	Predictor	β	t -value	p -value
1. Affective Resistance ($R^2 = 0.35$)				
	Role Ambiguity	0.47	7.16	0.000
	Work Overload	0.20	2.74	0.007
	Cognitive Switching Cost	0.14	2.09	0.038
2. Willingness to Engage ($R^2 = 0.20$)				
	Perceived Benefit	0.22	3.93	0.000
	Affective Resistance	-0.25	-4.86	0.000
3. Long-Term Adoption ($R^2 = 0.21$)				
	Willingness to Engage	0.55	7.42	0.000

resistance were less willing to participate actively in non-STEM coursework.

Thus, Hypothesis 2 is supported.

E. Hypothesis 3: Willingness to Engage Predicting Long-Term Adoption

Hypothesis 3 proposed that Willingness to Engage would positively predict Long-Term Adoption.

Table II shows that Willingness to Engage strongly predicted Long-Term Adoption ($\beta = 0.55$, $p < .001$). Students who were more willing to engage in non-STEM coursework were more likely to apply related competencies in future academic and professional contexts.

Hypothesis 3 is strongly supported.

F. Summary of Findings

Across all models summarized in Table II, results consistently supported the three hypotheses. Cognitive Switching Cost, Work Overload, and Role Ambiguity collectively predicted Affective Resistance. Affective Resistance, in turn, reduced students' willingness to engage in non-STEM learning activities. Finally, Willingness to Engage was the strongest determinant of students' long-term adoption of interdisciplinary competencies.

Overall, the findings demonstrate a sequential pattern in which role ambiguity elevates emotional resistance, which suppresses engagement and ultimately reduces long-term adoption of non-STEM competencies.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Overview of Findings

The purpose of this study was to identify the psychological and structural factors driving engineering students' resistance

to mandatory non-STEM coursework and to examine how this resistance affects engagement and long-term skill adoption. The results supported all three hypotheses and revealed a clear sequential pattern: antecedent factors heightened Affective Resistance; resistance reduced students' Willingness to Engage; and willingness strongly predicted Long-Term Adoption of soft skills.

B. Role Ambiguity as the Dominant Driver of Resistance

The strongest predictor of Affective Resistance was Role Ambiguity, suggesting that if students were uncertain about the role of non-STEM courses in their identity as engineers, they were more likely to be resistant to the material emotionally than cognitively or in terms of workload, and this indicates that identity alignment is a more important determinant of resistance than cognitive or structural constraints. If students don't see why the material matters, then even relatively small obstacles can lead to disproportionately strong negative reactions.

C. Cognitive and Structural Pressures Contribute but Are Secondary

Cognitive Switching Cost and Work Overload were also significant predictors of Affective Resistance. Still, the effects were undoubtedly much weaker than that of Role Ambiguity, which implies that although students indeed experience the mental cost of switching between STEM and non-STEM cognitive frameworks and the pressure of competing academic demands, these factors alone do not fully account for the negative emotional response. Typically, students can withstand cognitive and structural burdens when the relevance is clear; however, the uncertainty of purpose intensifies adverse emotional reactions.

D. Resistance as a Bottleneck to Engagement

In alignment with Hypothesis 2, Affective Resistance is strongly negatively related to Willingness to Engage, suggesting that once students develop resistance, their willingness to engage drops substantially, and this suggests that emotional responses are a major choke-point in interdisciplinary learning, which also explains why soft-skill programs can be unsuccessful, even when included in engineering curricula, because the material is not inherently objectionable. Still, resistance prevents the material from being used.

E. Engagement as the Key Predictor of Long-Term Adoption

The most robust finding was a positive association between Willingness to Engage and Long-Term Adoption, that is, the more that students were willing to engage with non-STEM coursework, the more likely they were to take forward the competencies developed in the classroom into their studies and professions. This suggests that engagement is the principal lever that can be manipulated to improve the long-term adoption of non-STEM competencies, and in practical terms, this means that interventions should focus on building engagement early, and that even when cognitive effort or workload pressures were present, getting students engaged appeared to matter most for long-term adoption.

F. Implications for Curriculum and Instruction

The findings suggest several actionable strategies for improving interdisciplinary outcomes in engineering programs:

- **Reduce Role Ambiguity:** Explicitly communicate how non-STEM competencies support engineering practice. Use discipline-relevant examples, alumni testimonials, and integrative assignments to demonstrate relevance.
- **Manage Cognitive Switching:** Structure coursework to minimize abrupt transitions between technical and interpretive tasks, or provide scaffolding to support cognitive flexibility.
- **Address Workload Perceptions:** Coordinate assessments across departments to prevent clustering and reduce perceived overload.
- **Prioritize Early Engagement:** Begin non-STEM courses with low-stakes, collaborative activities that generate psychological buy-in before resistance becomes entrenched.

G. Theoretical Contributions

This study makes several contributions to the interdisciplinary STEM education literature:

- 1) It demonstrates that identity-related uncertainty (Role Ambiguity) is a more influential driver of emotional resistance than cognitive or structural pressures.
- 2) It establishes Affective Resistance as a psychological bottleneck linking antecedent strain to reduced engagement.
- 3) It identifies Willingness to Engage as the strongest determinant of long-term soft-skill adoption, clarifying why curricular reforms often fail without early attention to engagement.

H. Limitations and Future Research

A few limitations are worth mentioning, and first, all measures were based on self-reports. Standard-method bias may have influenced the results, and second, the design was cross-sectional. Therefore, no causal conclusions can be drawn; a longitudinal study could clarify whether engagement predicts long-term adoption. A longitudinal study could clarify whether engagement predicts long-term adoption. Third, the sample was recruited from one school. Thus, generalizability is limited; future research should therefore consider this limitation.

Future research should replicate our results across different institutions and include behavioral or performance-based assessments of engagement and skill acquisition as complements to self-report measures, thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between engagement and skill acquisition.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study examines why engineering students resist mandatory non-STEM courses and how that resistance influences their willingness to engage and their eventual adoption of soft skills. By considering three factors together - cognitive switching cost, work overload, and role ambiguity - using a regression-based approach, the study explains why interdisciplinary learning continues to be an issue in engineering programs, and the results show that role ambiguity is the strongest driver of affective resistance. In other words, students' uncertainty about how non-STEM courses relate to their identity as engineers matters more than the mental switching effort or workload, and that affective resistance, in turn, reduces students' willingness to engage, suggesting that emotional reactions can impede even well-designed curricula. Most importantly, willingness to engage is the strongest predictor of long-term adoption, meaning that institutions must trigger engagement early if they want students to carry soft skills into their studies and careers. Overall, the results suggest that programs should prioritize clarity, relevance, and alignment with engineering identity when designing interdisciplinary coursework, because students are not simply reacting to difficulty or heavy workloads. Still, they are reacting to whether the experience feels meaningful and connected to who they are becoming professionally.

While the data from this study have limitations, including its basis in a single institution and its reliance on self-report, they provide helpful insights into the psychology of resistance to interdisciplinary learning, and they offer practical advice to the designer of non-STEM coursework in ways that can reduce such resistance and increase long-term uptake of soft skills. Future research should continue to test these patterns across different contexts, and it would be helpful for future studies to include behavioral indicators of engagement or performance-based measures of soft-skill growth. Even with these limitations, this work provides a valuable examination of the psychology of resistance to interdisciplinary learning and practical recommendations for designing non-STEM coursework that feels relevant, manageable, and professionally meaningful to engineering students. Therefore, this study contributes to

TABLE III
FULL SURVEY INSTRUMENT (ALL ITEMS MEASURED ON A 5-POINT LIKERT SCALE: 1=STRONGLY DISAGREE TO 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Item	Questionnaires	Adapted/Adopted Sources	Original Sources
Cognitive Switching Cost	Adjusting my learning style for non-STEM courses is more challenging than for STEM courses. Switching focus from STEM to non-STEM subjects is mentally exhausting.	Kim and Kankanhalli [28]; Klocker [29]	Jones et al. [30]
Switching Benefit	Non-STEM courses improve my soft skills, such as communication and critical thinking. Studying non-STEM subjects broadens my overall perspective on learning.	Kim and Kankanhalli [28]; Klocker [29]	Moore and Benbasat [31]
Work Overload	Non-STEM courses significantly increase my academic workload. Managing both STEM and non-STEM courses is challenging.	Ayyagari et al. [32]	Moore [33]
Role Ambiguity	I am unsure how non-STEM courses contribute to my academic goals. I struggle to see the practical application of non-STEM subjects compared to STEM subjects.	Ayyagari et al. [32]	Moore [33]
Work–Home Conflict	Balancing non-STEM and STEM coursework leaves me with less time for personal activities.	Ayyagari et al. [32]	Netemeyer et al. [34]
Affective Resistance (AR)	I feel that non-STEM courses are a waste of my time compared to STEM courses. Courses in the humanities (e.g., literature, philosophy) are unnecessary for STEM students. Social science courses (e.g., sociology, psychology) seem less relevant to my field than STEM subjects.	Ayyagari et al. [32]	Moore [33]
Willingness to Engage (W)	I believe non-STEM courses are valuable despite their challenges. I am open to integrating lessons from non-STEM courses into my academic work.	AlHirz and Sajeev [35]	Moore [33]
Long-Term Adoption (LTA)	I will likely apply the knowledge I gain from non-STEM courses in my personal or professional life.	Kim and Kankanhalli [28]; Klocker [29]	Sirdeshmukh et al. [36]

a better understanding of how to improve interdisciplinary learning in engineering programs.

VII. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships.

VIII. FUNDING INFORMATION

N/A

IX. DATA AVAILABILITY

The dataset used in this study is publicly available and described in detail in the Methodology section.

X. APPENDIX A: MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT, ITEMS, AND SOURCES

This section provides the complete documentation of the multi-item scales used to measure the latent constructs in the structural model. The purpose of this appendix is to ensure complete transparency and enable replication of the measurement model.

XI. APPENDIX B: RESPONSE OPTIONS FOR OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

This appendix clarifies the specific choices available for structured demographic items and provides the full text of the open-ended questions.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. D. Sheppard, K. Macatangay, A. Colby, and W. M. Sullivan, "Educating engineers: Designing for the future of the field. book highlights." *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, 2008.
- [2] E. A. Commission et al., "Criteria for accrediting engineering programs," *Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology Inc*, 1999.
- [3] E. Godfrey and L. Parker, "Mapping the cultural landscape in engineering education," *Journal of Engineering education*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 5–22, 2010.
- [4] R. Stevens, K. O'Connor, L. Garrison, A. Jocuns, and D. M. Amos, "Becoming an engineer: Toward a three dimensional view of engineering learning," *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 97, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:110451542>
- [5] V. Venkatesh, "Determinants of perceived ease of use: Integrating control, intrinsic motivation, and emotion into the technology acceptance model," *Information systems research*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 342–365, 2000.
- [6] H.-W. Kim and A. Kankanhalli, "Investigating user resistance to information systems implementation: A status quo bias perspective," *MIS quarterly*, pp. 567–582, 2009.
- [7] J. R. Rizzo, R. J. House, and S. I. Lirtzman, "Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations," *Administrative science quarterly*, pp. 150–163, 1970.
- [8] R. D. Rogers and S. Monsell, "Costs of a predictable switch between simple cognitive tasks," *Journal of experimental psychology: General*, vol. 124, no. 2, p. 207, 1995.
- [9] L. H. Evis, "A critical appraisal of interdisciplinary research and education in british higher education institutions: A path forward?" *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, vol. 21, pp. 119–138, 4 2022.
- [10] J. F. Hair, "Multivariate data analysis," 2009.
- [11] M. Boekaerts, "The crucial role of motivation and emotion in classroom learning," *Educational research and innovation*, pp. 91–111, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:141251075>
- [12] Z. Dağhan and B. Çam Aktaş, "Resistance behaviors of secondary school students: Teacher and student views," *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:277311721>

TABLE IV
RESPONSE OPTIONS FOR OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Open-Ended Question	Description
Which non-STEM courses have been most beneficial to you and why?	Text response used to gather qualitative examples of course utility and perceived benefit.
What challenges have you faced balancing STEM and non-STEM coursework?	Text response used to gather context on work-home conflict, cognitive strain, and structural challenges.
Your perspective on STEM versus non-STEM courses.	Text response used to gather holistic, generalized sentiment and identify new themes.

- [13] M. Salanova, S. Llorens, and E. Cifre, "The dark side of technologies: Technostress among users of information and communication technologies," *International Journal of Psychology*, vol. 48, pp. 422–436, 6 2013.
- [14] P. S. Sarker, S. K. Banshal, M. A. H. Newton, S. I. Anika, M. A. S. Sristy, and A. Chakroborty, "Perceived key factors affecting online university classrooms," *Education and Information Technologies* 2025, pp. 1–32, 9 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-025-13744-w>
- [15] P. Willmot and B. Colman, "Interpersonal skills in engineering education," 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:54812741>
- [16] D. Oyserman and M. Destin, "Identity-based motivation: Implications for intervention," *The Counseling Psychologist*, vol. 38, pp. 1001–1043, 10 2010.
- [17] A. Brown and J. Bimrose, "Learning and identity development at work," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:158368704>
- [18] L. R. Lattuca, "Ac 2012-3116: Developing a measure of interdisciplinary competence for engineers," 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55122320>
- [19] H. Pashler, P. Joliceur, R. Dell'Acqua, J. Crebolder, T. Goschke, R. de Jong, N. Meiran, R. B. Ivry, and E. Hazeltine, "Task switching and multitask performance," 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59760133>
- [20] J. S. Rubinstein, D. E. Meyer, and J. E. Evans, "Executive control of cognitive processes in task switching," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, vol. 27, pp. 763–797, 2001.
- [21] F. Paas, A. Renkl, and J. Sweller, "Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments," *Educational Psychologist*, vol. 38, pp. 1 – 4, 2003. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:8107220>
- [22] G. Scully and R. Kerr, "Student workload and assessment: Strategies to manage expectations and inform curriculum development," *Accounting Education*, vol. 23, pp. 443–466, 9 2014.
- [23] D. Leonard-Barton, "Wellsprings of knowledge: Building and sustaining the sources of innovation," 1995. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:166817818>
- [24] R. S. Root-Bernstein, "Stemm education should get "hacd"," *Science*, vol. 361, pp. 22 – 23, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:51601003>
- [25] W. Newell, "The promise of integrative learning," *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience*, vol. 4, pp. 17 – 23, 1999. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:140757130>
- [26] M. A. A. Kafi and R. Moni, "Stem student course perception(sscp) dataset," vol. 3, 2025.
- [27] "abkafi1234/studentgrumbling," [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/abkafi1234/StudentGrumbling/tree/main>
- [28] H.-W. Kim and A. Kankanhalli, "Investigating user resistance to information systems implementation: A status quo bias perspective1," *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 567–582, 09 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.2307/20650309>
- [29] P. Klöcker, *Resistance behavior to national EHealth implementation programs*. Springer, 2015.
- [30] M. A. Jones, D. L. Mothersbaugh, and S. E. Beatty, "Switching barriers and repurchase intentions in services," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 76, pp. 259–274, 6 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022435900000245>
- [31] G. C. Moore and I. Benbasat, "Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation," *Information Systems Research*, vol. 2, pp. 192–222, 9 1991.
- [32] R. Ayyagari, V. Grover, and R. Purvis, "Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications1," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 35, pp. 831–A10, 12 2011.
- [33] J. E. Moore, "One road to turnover: An examination of work exhaustion in technology professionals1," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 24, pp. 141–168, 3 2000.
- [34] R. G. Netemeyer, J. S. Boles, and R. McMurrian, "Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 81, pp. 400–410, 8 1996.
- [35] H. AlHirz and A. Sajeev, "Factors influencing symbolic adoption of erp systems in the middle-east," in *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Enterprise Systems: ES 2013*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–8.
- [36] D. Sirdeshmukh, J. Singh, and B. Sabol, "Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 66, pp. 15–37, 1 2002.